UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,348	12/12/2003	Mustansir M. Banatwala	LOT9-2003-0071-US1 (7321-	3612

46321	7590	04/27/2005	EXAMINER

CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG PA
200 E LAS OLAS BLVD
SUITE 2040
FT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301

TIV, BACKHEAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/734,348	BANATWALA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Backhean Tiv	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12/12/03</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5,7-12,14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by US Publication No. 2001/0025299 issued to Chang et al.(Chang).

As per claim 1, 8, 15, Chang teaches collaborative computing method for the

establishment of a named collaborative space(Abstract), the method comprising:

providing a named space defining a work place within the collaborative computing

environment(Abstract, para.009, Fig.5); identifying a membership set for the

collaborative space, the membership set including one or more

members(para.0046,0053); and providing at least one business process accessible

within the named space(para.0053); storing a membership set for the collaborative

space, the membership set identifying one or more members(para.0046,0053);

a database, the database storing(Fig.14): a membership set for the collaborative

space, the membership set identifying one or more members(para.0050,0053); and

data corresponding to a named space defining a work place within the collaborative

computing environment(Abstrac, para.009, Fig.5); and a central processing unit

functioning to provide at least one business process accessible within the named space,

the central processing unit in operative communication with the database(para.0053).

As per claim 2, 9, 16 wherein the at least one business process is a business

component instance visualized via a portlet(para.0050).

As per claim 3,10,17 wherein the members of membership set for the

collaborative space are assigned a role, the role defining access and permission

privileges to the at least one business process(para.0050).

As per claim 4,11,18 wherein the established named collaborative space is

templatable to serve as the basis for the establishment of other named collaborative

spaces(para.0019).

As per claim 5,12,19 wherein the established named collaborative

space is provisionable from other named collaborative spaces(para.0019).

As per claim 7,14 further including assigning a policy to the named

space(para.0011).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

Publication No. 2001/0025299 issued to Chang et al.(Chang) in view of Office Notice.

Chang does not explicitly teach as per claim 6, 13, the transfer of information

using enterprise java bean.

Office Notice is taken; it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the

art at the time of the invention to use enterprise java bean to transfer information

because java bean is a reusable application component that can be combined with

other java bean components to create a java applet or application. It would have been

obvious to add the use of java bean to transfer information to Chang in order transfer

messages from one person to another with different computing platform.

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated to combine the use of java bean with Chang in order to provide a system

where once a program is written once, it can run on any computing platform to transfer

information from one user to another.

Claims 1-5,7-12,14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent 5,247,615 issued to Mori et al.(Mori) in view of US

Publication No. 2001/0025299 issued to Chang et al.(Chang).

As per claim 1, 8, 15, Mori teaches collaborative computing method for the

establishment of a named collaborative space(Fig.3), the method comprising:

providing a named space defining a work place within the collaborative computing

environment(Fig.3); identifying a membership set for the collaborative space, the

membership set including one or more members(Fig.3, col.1, lines 34-49); and

·providing at least one business process accessible within the named space(Fig.3);

storing a membership set for the collaborative space, the membership set identifying

one or more members(Fig.3); a membership set for the collaborative space, the

membership set identifying one or more members(Fig.3); and data corresponding to a

named space defining a work place within the collaborative computing

environment(Fig.3); and a central processing unit functioning to provide at least one

business process accessible within the named space(Fig.3, col.1, lines 34-49, Abstract).

Mori however does not explicitly teach a database and the central processing

unit in operative communication with the database.

Chang teaches a database(Fig.14) and the central processing unit in operative

communication with the database(para.0035).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time

of the invention to modify the teaching of Mori to use a database and a central

processing unit in operative communication with the database as taught by Chang in

order to store information.

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have motivated

to combine Mori and Chang in order to provide a system where there is a place to store

the information of members an electronic meeting.

As per claim 2, 9, 16 wherein the at least one business process is a business component instance visualized via a portlet(Mori, Fig.4).

As per claim 3,10,17 wherein the members of membership set for the collaborative space are assigned a role, the role defining access and permission privileges to the at least one business process(Mori, col.5, lines 30-42, Figs.13-19).

As per claim 4,11,18 wherein the established named collaborative space is templatable to serve as the basis for the establishment of other named collaborative spaces(Chang, para.0019).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Mori to add established named collaborative space is templatable to serve as the basis for the establishment of other named collaborative spaces as taught by Chang in order to establish more than one working space.

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Chang and Mori in order to provide a system where there is multiple electronic meetings.

As per claim 5,12,19 wherein the established named collaborative space is provisionable from other named collaborative spaces(Chang, para.0019). See claim 4 for motivation to combine.

As per claim 7,14 further including assigning a policy to the named space(Mori, Fig.3, col.4, lines 6-50).

Claims 6,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

Patent 5,247,615 issued to Mori et al.(Mori) in view of US Publication No. 2001/0025299

issued to Chang et al.(Chang) in further view of Office Notice.

Mori in view of Chang does not explicitly teach as per claim 6, 13, the transfer of

information using enterprise java bean.

Office Notice is taken; it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the

art at the time of the invention to use enterprise java bean to transfer information

because java bean is a reusable application component that can be combined with

other java bean components to create a java applet or application. It would have been

obvious to add the use of java bean to transfer information to Mori in view of Chang in

order transfer messages from one person to another with different computing platform.

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated to combine the use of java bean with Mori in view Chang in order to provide a

system where once a program is written once, it can run on any computing platform to

transfer information from one user to another.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571)272-

3941. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 A.M.-12 P.M. and 1 -6 P.M.

Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Backhean Tiv
2151
4/21/05

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER